



# COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

## DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

*"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"*

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE  
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331  
Telephone: (626) 458-5100  
<http://dpw.lacounty.gov>

**GAIL FARBER, Director**

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:  
P.O. BOX 1460  
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460

July 05, 2011

The Honorable Board of Supervisors  
County of Los Angeles  
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration  
500 West Temple Street  
Los Angeles, California 90012

# ADOPTED

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

37 July 5, 2011

*Sachi A. Hamai*  
SACHI A. HAMAI  
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

SET: July 26, 2011 @ 9:30 a.m.

Dear Supervisors:

### HEARING ON THE FORMATION OF THE WESTSIDE BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICT IN THE UNINCORPORATED AREA OF SANTA CLARITA (SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT 5) (3 VOTES)

#### SUBJECT

Set July 26, 2011, as the date for the public hearing for the proposed formation of the Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District and the establishment of the boundaries, district improvements, associated costs, and fee rates therefore. The fee revenues would be used to finance the construction of bridge and highway improvements to provide full mitigation of traffic impacts resulting from new development in the proposed district.

#### **IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:**

1. Receive and file the Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District Report, dated February 2011, prepared by the Director of Public Works, recommending establishment of the boundaries, list of projects, estimated costs, and fees for the Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District.
2. Set July 26, 2011, as the date for the public hearing regarding the proposed formation of the Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District.

AFTER THE PUBLIC HEARING, IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE BOARD:

1. Determine whether written protests against the proposed formation have been filed and not withdrawn by the owners of more than one half of the area of the properties within the Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District.
2. If a majority written protest does not exist:
  - a. Find that the formation of the Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act.
  - b. Adopt the Resolution establishing the Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District.
  - c. Authorize Public Works to administer the Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District.
  - d. Instruct Public Works to record a certified copy of the adopted Resolution with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office.
3. If a written majority protest exists, refer this matter back to Public Works.

#### **PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

The purpose of the recommended actions is to find that the formation of the Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare (B&T) Construction Fee District (District) is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and to establish the boundaries, improvements, costs, fees, and related items for District.

If District is established, all subdivisions and certain qualifying building permits within District would be subject to a fee at the time that the subdivision is recorded or when the building permit is issued. The amount of the fee would be proportional to the impact of the vehicle trips estimated to be generated by the development based on development type and nationally accepted trip generation rates.

The fee revenues would be used to finance the construction of the bridge and highway improvements (District Improvements) designated in the Westside B&T Construction Fee District Report dated February 2011 (District Report). The District Improvements are in addition to existing facilities and would provide for the mitigation of traffic impacts of new development anticipated to occur within District.

A new interest bearing Special Revenue Fund would be needed to account for the new fee revenues.

#### **Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals**

The Countywide Strategic Plan directs the provisions of Service Excellence (Goal 1) and Community and Municipal Services (Goal 3) by constructing road and bridge facilities to provide improved traffic circulation for residents that improve the quality of life in the County of Los Angeles (County).

#### **FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING**

There will be no impact to the County General Fund. The estimated cost to complete the proposed District improvements is \$526 million. All fee revenue generated from the District will be expended on the District Improvements. Sufficient funds will be available from District fees and anticipated grant funding to finance the proposed improvements. The proposed fee will not affect Public Works' current fiscal year budget. This will have no impact on net County cost for the current or future fiscal years.

### **FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS**

The District is proposed to be formed pursuant to Section 66484 of the Government Code and Section 21.32.200 of the Los Angeles County Code. Section 66484 authorizes the County to impose, by ordinance, a requirement for the payment of fees prior to final map recordation or the issuance of a building permit, to defray the actual or estimated costs of constructing bridges and major thoroughfares.

The County's ordinance implementing this authorization, generally, is codified in Section 21.32.200 of the Los Angeles County Code.

In accordance with the provisions of Government Code Section 66484 and Section 21.32.200 of the County Code, your Board may establish the boundaries, costs, improvements, and fees of a bridge and major thoroughfare district only after a public hearing and only if there is no majority protest (e.g., written protest by the owners of more than one half of the area of District). Notice of the hearing, including preliminary information related to the boundaries of the area of benefit, estimated costs and the method of fee apportionment, must be given pursuant to the provisions of Section 65091 of the Government Code.

As indicated in the District Report, District Improvements are intended to mitigate the traffic impacts that will result from the anticipated future development within the District. District Improvements would fully improve all roadways identified on the County circulation element within District boundaries. Improvements will include full-width grading, base, pavement, curb, gutter, sidewalk, medians, striping, bus pads (where applicable), bike lanes (where applicable), fully improved and signalized intersections, signal interconnect systems (where applicable), street lighting, roadway-related utility relocation, drainage structures within road right of way, and full improvements for bridges and freeway interchanges. Right of way is assumed to be dedicated by individual development projects except for State highway projects and roadway widening that is unrelated to private development.

Adoption of the enclosed Resolution will provide for the formation of the District. The Resolution establishes the boundaries of District, District Improvements, the method of fee apportionment, and provides for an annual fee adjustment ranging from plus or minus 5 percent in the fee rate based on the Construction Cost Index. The Resolution also complies with the requirements of Government Code Section 66000, et seq., regarding the imposition of new development fees. The proposed Resolution has been approved as to form by County Counsel.

Once adopted, certified copies of the Resolution will be recorded with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION**

The proposed project is statutorily exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Adoption of the proposed Resolution, as to form, is for the Westside B&T District's purpose of obtaining funds for capital projects necessary to maintain services within existing service areas and, therefore, is exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 21080(b)(8) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15273(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines.

**IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)**

Approval and formation of the District by your Board will ensure the timely completion of the much-needed roadway and bridge improvements to serve the future circulation needs created by new developments within the District. District Improvements will help mitigate the additional traffic congestion impacts generated by approved subdivisions and building permits within the District.

**CONCLUSION**

Please return one adopted copy of this letter and one copy of the recorded Resolution to the Department of Public Works, Land Development Division.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Gail Farber".

GAIL FARBER  
Director

GF:AEN:la

Enclosures

c: Chief Executive Office (Rita Robinson)  
County Counsel  
Executive Office

**RESOLUTION OF THE  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
ESTABLISHING THE WESTSIDE  
BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICT**

WHEREAS, Section 21.32.200 to the Los Angeles County Code, authorizes the County to establish areas of benefit for the purpose of imposing a fee on subdividers and building permit recipients in the established area of benefit, to defray the costs of constructing bridges and major thoroughfares benefitting the property proposed to be developed; and

WHEREAS, there is an identified need for bridge and major thoroughfare projects to serve the circulation needs of new development expected to occur in the unincorporated west side area of the Santa Clarita Valley; and

WHEREAS, the following highways and interchanges are identified in County's General Plan and are considered major thoroughfares under Section 21.32.200: Hasley Canyon Road with its interchange with I-5; The Old Road (including bridge); Commerce Center Drive (including bridge); Chiquito Canyon Road; Rye Canyon Road; Long Canyon Road (including bridge); Magic Mountain Parkway and its interchange with I-5, Valencia Boulevard; Potrero Valley Road; State Route 126 and its interchanges with Commerce Center Drive, Long Canyon Road and Chiquito Canyon Road; Henry Mayo Drive; and Wolcott Way; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Public Works has prepared the Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare District Report, dated February, 2011 (District Report), which recommends the establishment of an area of benefit, the Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District (District), and describes the proposed boundaries of District, the projects proposed to be constructed within District (District Improvements), the costs of the District Improvements, a fair method of allocation of those costs, and the proposed fees for District; and

WHEREAS, this Board conducted a public hearing regarding the establishment of the District, notice of which was given in accordance with Government Code Section 65091, and no majority protest was filed at the hearing.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES HEREBY FINDS, DETERMINES, AND RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

1. The establishment of the District is for the purpose of obtaining funds for capital projects necessary to maintain services within existing service areas and, therefore, is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 21080(b)(8) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15273(a) of the State California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.
2. The area of benefit, known as the Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District, is hereby established in accordance with and as described in the District Report, attached hereto and incorporated herein.
3. The boundaries of the District are as described in Attachment A to the District Report.
4. The estimated total cost of the District Improvements is \$526 million.
5. The total cost of the District Improvements shall be allocated as described in the District Report, and the fees applicable within the District (District Fees) shall be as follows:

Residential Property:

|               |                |
|---------------|----------------|
| Single-Family | \$ 21,400/unit |
| Townhouse     | \$ 17,120/unit |
| Apartment     | \$ 14,980/unit |

Non-Residential Property:

|            |                      |
|------------|----------------------|
| Commercial | \$107,000/gross acre |
| Industrial | \$64,200/gross acre  |

6. The District Fees shall be subject to an automatic annual adjustment, based on changes in the Los Angeles Regional Construction Cost Index, as described in the District Report.
7. The Auditor-Controller Accounting Division is hereby directed to set up a new interest bearing Special Revenue fund for the District.
8. The County and other governmental agencies may contribute or make loans to the District.



The foregoing Resolution was on the 26<sup>th</sup> day of July 2011, adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles and ex officio the governing body of all other special assessment and taxing districts, agencies, and authorities for which said Board so acts.



SACHI A. HAMAI  
Executive Officer of the  
Board of Supervisors of the  
County of Los Angeles

By Lachelle Smith  
Deputy

APPROVED TO FORM:

ANDREA SHERIDAN ORDIN  
County Counsel

By [Signature]  
Deputy



# **WESTSIDE BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICT REPORT**

---

Prepared for:



**LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

900 South Fremont Ave.  
Alhambra, CA 91803-1331

**February 2011**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| I.   | SUMMARY .....   | 1  |
| A.   | BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE<br>DISTRICTS IN THE SANTA CLARITA VALLEY ..... | 1  |
| B.   | NEED FOR DISTRICT FORMATION .....   | 2  |
| C.   | DISTRICT FEE RATES .....  | 2  |
| II.  | THE BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE<br>DISTRICT .....                          | 5  |
| A.   | AUTHORITY .....   | 5  |
| B.   | PURPOSE .....   | 5  |
| C.   | CONCEPT .....   | 6  |
| D.   | DISTRICT FORMATION AND STATUS .....   | 6  |
| III. | WESTSIDE AREA ACCESS .....  | 7  |
| A.   | BACKGROUND .....  | 7  |
| B.   | EXISTING CIRCULATION AND PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS .....  | 7  |
| IV.  | THE WESTSIDE BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION<br>FEE DISTRICT .....                 | 20 |
| A.   | THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY .....   | 20 |
| B.   | DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS .....  | 20 |
| C.   | PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS AND ESTIMATED COSTS .....   | 21 |
| D.   | IMPROVEMENT PHASING .....   | 22 |
| E.   | TRAFFIC AND LAND USE ANALYSIS .....   | 22 |
| F.   | THE DISTRICT FEE .....  | 23 |

|    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
| G. | CONSTRUCTION OF DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS IN LIEU OF PAYING FEES ..... | 27 |
| H. | CREDIT AWARD AND CASH REIMBURSEMENT .....                          | 27 |
| I. | RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION.....                                      | 29 |
| J. | PROVISIONS FOR UPDATING COSTS AND UNIT INFORMATION .....           | 29 |
| K. | PROPOSAL FOR DISTRICT CLOSURE .....                                | 30 |
| L. | DISTRICT FUNDS.....  | 30 |
| M. | THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS .....                                   | 30 |

## **LIST OF FIGURES**

|          |   |    |
|----------|---|----|
| FIGURE 1 | WESTSIDE BRIDGE AND THOROUGHFARE DISTRICT – EXISTING AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ..... | 4  |
| FIGURE 2 | WESTSIDE BRIDGE AND THOROUGHFARE DISTRICT □ LINK AND INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS ..... | 18 |
| FIGURE 3 | WESTSIDE BRIDGE AND THOROUGHFARE DISTRICT □ PROPOSED INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS..... | 19 |

## **LIST OF TABLES**

|          |                                |    |
|----------|--------------------------------|----|
| TABLE 1: | PROPOSED DISTRICT FEE .....    | 3  |
| TABLE 2: | LIST OF IMPROVEMENTS .....     | 8  |
| TABLE 3: | DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS .....     | 21 |
| TABLE 4: | SOFT COST PERCENTAGES .....    | 22 |
| TABLE 5: | DISTRICT FEE CALCULATION ..... | 23 |

**LIST OF ATTACHMENTS**

ATTACHMENT A □ LEGAL DESCRIPTION ..... 32

ATTACHMENT B - SUMMARY OF COST ESTIMATES FOR DISTRICT  
IMPROVEMENTS ..... 35

ATTACHMENT C - DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS ..... 38

ATTACHMENT D - COUNTY AND CITY CODES  
PERTAINING TO B&T DISTRICTS ..... 39

ATTACHMENT E - B&T CASH/CREDIT REQUEST FORM ..... 43

## **I. SUMMARY**

The Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District Report presents to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors for approval, an area of benefit for financing specific improvements in the Westside area of the Santa Clarita Valley, within the Los Angeles County jurisdictions. Improvements include, but are not limited to new and improved roadways, bridges, intersections, and interchanges.

Establishing the Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District, hereinafter referred to as "District," will provide an equitable financing mechanism by which new development within an identified area will share the costs of providing full mitigation improvements, as discussed in this summary.

State Subdivision Law and the Los Angeles County Code authorize the use of bridge and major thoroughfare construction fee districts for the funding and construction of improvements, provided these facilities are identified on the local agency's adopted transportation element of its General Plan. Based on the transportation needs in this area of the Santa Clarita Valley, and the limitations of other funding sources, this funding method has been determined to be the best alternative to provide needed improvements.

This report describes the concept and mechanics of the District. Information included in this report will enable subject property owners to determine the fee to be assessed against their property if and when it is developed. A map of the District has been included as Figure 1.

### ***A. BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICTS IN THE SANTA CLARITA VALLEY***

Prior to the 1980's, the County was able to assist developers in the funding and construction of needed highway improvements. However, gas tax revenue, formerly the traditional source of funding for new highway and bridge improvements, has not provided sufficient funding towards improvements in the Santa Clarita Valley. Due to the regional nature of many of the district improvements, the District shall pursue funding for eligible regional improvements from County, State, and Federal agencies, to supplement the adopted District fee.

The current highway system in the Santa Clarita Valley is considered adequate for existing development. However, at this time public funding is not available to adequately provide highway improvements for the future anticipated development in the Santa Clarita Valley.

The Santa Clarita Valley Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee Districts are designed to accommodate the needs of future development anticipated by the Los Angeles County Santa Clarita Valley Area Wide Circulation Plan.

### ***B. NEED FOR DISTRICT FORMATION***

The District needs to be formed to encompass the significant proposed growth in this area. The District proposes to fully improve the roadways identified on the Santa Clarita Valley Area Wide Circulation Plan, including intersections and interchanges.

Full mitigation improvements will include full-width grading, base, pavement, curb, gutter, sidewalk, medians, striping for capacity enhancement, bus pads, fully improved and signalized intersections, signal interconnect (where applicable), street lighting, roadway-related utility relocation, drainage structures within road right-of-way, and full improvements for bridges and interchanges.

Right of-way is assumed to be dedicated by individual development projects, except for state highway projects and roadway widening projects that are unrelated to private development projects. Provisions for updating the District Fee are also being included in this report.

### ***C. DISTRICT FEE RATES***


District improvements to roadways, bridges, intersections, and interchanges total an estimated \$525.6 million. The Summary of Cost Estimates for District Improvements is included as Attachment B.

This new District analyzes build-out development for vacant land for which there is no previously-recorded map. To determine District build-out, a development analysis based on filed tentative maps, Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan, and Newhall Ranch Specific Plan designations was performed. This analysis indicates that the amount of remaining development is estimated at 22,007 factored development units (FDUs). The Development Analysis is included as Attachment C.

Taking the potential funding and the cash in District into account, the proposed District fee is proposed to be \$21,400 per FDU. The analysis concludes that a District fee is necessary to fully fund these improvements. The proposed District fees are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: Proposed District Fee**

| <b>Land Use Category</b>    | <b>Factor</b> | <b>Proposed District Fee</b> |
|-----------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|
| Residential:                |               |                              |
| Single Family (per unit)    | 1.0 per unit  | \$21,400                     |
| Townhome/Condo (per unit)   | 0.8 per unit  | \$17,120                     |
| Apartment (per unit)        | 0.7 per unit  | \$14,980                     |
| Non-Residential:            |               |                              |
| Commercial (per gross acre) | 5.0 per acre  | \$107,000                    |
| Industrial (per gross acre) | 3.0 per acre  | \$64,200                     |





## **II. THE BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICT**

### ***A. AUTHORITY***

The State of California Government Code Section 66484, regarding Subdivisions, gives local agencies the authority to adopt local ordinances that may require the payment of a fee as a condition of approval of a final map or as a condition of issuing a building permit for purposes of defraying the actual or estimated cost of constructing bridges over waterways, railways, freeways, and canyons, or constructing major thoroughfare. The local adopted ordinance must refer to the circulation element of its General Plan, provide for a public hearing, provide for the establishment of boundaries of an area of benefit, and provide for the identification of the costs, a fair method of allocation of costs to the area of benefit and a fair fee apportionment (to be disclosed at the public hearing). Further, the local ordinance must provide that the payment of fees shall not be required unless the major thoroughfares are in addition to or a reconstruction of any existing thoroughfares serving the area at the time of district adoption. It must further provide that if owners of more than one-half of the area of property to be benefited by the improvement(s) file proper written protests, the district proceedings as proposed shall be abandoned for at least one year. The local ordinance allows acceptance of considerations in lieu of the payment of fees, permits a local agency to advance money from its general fund or road fund to be reimbursed from bridge and major thoroughfare funds, permits a local agency to incur an interest bearing indebtedness for the construction of bridge or major thoroughfare facilities, and does not preclude an agency from providing funds for the construction of bridge or major thoroughfare facilities to defray costs not allocated to the District.

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors adopted Ordinance No. 82-0050 on March 2, 1982, adding Section 21.32.200 to the Los Angeles County Code, providing for the establishment of bridge and major thoroughfare construction fees to be paid by sub divider or building permit applicants. These codes are consistent with the requirements and provisions of the State law (County Code Section 21.32.200 is included as Attachment D).

### ***B. PURPOSE***

The District has been designed to accommodate the needs of future development anticipated by the Los Angeles County Area Wide General Plan and the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. Establishing the District will provide local and regional benefits. Many of the District improvements will be eligible for local, state and federal funding. The District intends to pursue all potential sources of out-of-district funding for these improvements

including, but not limited to, State and Federal Gas Taxes, Propositions A and C Sales Tax, Transportation Planning and Development Sales Tax on Gasoline, County Transportation Tax, State Transportation Improvement Program funding, Federal Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century funds, State and Federal Highway Trust Funds, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds, special grants, and other sources that may be available. The District will provide the matching funds necessary to pursue greater funding from the aforementioned sources.

### **C. CONCEPT**

As authorized by statutes cited above, the adoption of a specific area of benefit permits the County of Los Angeles to levy a fee against future development located within the area of benefit. This funding method appropriately assesses developments, which create the need for additional improvements, for the additional public facility costs. The charge is levied in proportion to the estimated number of trips generated by the development which is translated into FDUs. FDUs are described in more detail in the "Development Analysis" section of this report.

The adoption of this type of funding district does not charge existing development. The District fee is collected at the time of recordation of a final map or just prior to the issuance of a building permit.

### **D. DISTRICT FORMATION AND STATUS**

The District is being formed for the purpose of financing highway and bridge improvements in the Westside area of Santa Clarita Valley. The Projects generally included in the District are The Old Road, Commerce Center Drive, Chiquito Canyon Road (from SR-126 to I-CCR-1), Rye Canyon Road, Long Canyon Road, Magic Mountain Parkway, Valencia Boulevard, Potrero Valley Road, State Route 126, and Wolcott Way.

The Westside Bridge and Thoroughfare District has been considered a "proposed" district for several years (previously referred to as the Magic Mountain Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District). Many development projects have been completed in the proposed District and have either paid fees, offset fees due with credit for construction of district-identified improvement, or secured fees with agreements.

Many large development projects and bridge and thoroughfare improvements remain in the District. Therefore, the District is proposed to be formed to fund new improvements which will serve the future development projects.

### **III.WESTSIDE AREA ACCESS**

#### ***A. BACKGROUND***

Historically, access to new development has been provided cooperatively by the County and land developers. The County funded its share with Gas Tax Funds. Land development was primarily concentrated in flatter areas, expanding away from urban centers. Public facilities were constructed to accommodate this expansion.

Much of the development in recent years and that which is expected to occur in the future is and will be in outlying areas where topography is more rugged and restrictive. As a result, the cost of providing necessary public facilities, including roadways will continue to increase.

#### ***B. EXISTING CIRCULATION AND PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS***

The Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare District is proposed as a full mitigation district, which means that B&T fees paid by development within the district, combined with other funding sources (e.g., state and federal funds, gas and sales taxes, etc.), have been calculated to cover the full cost of all improvements necessary to construct the arterial network as described in the county general plan transportation element and as envisioned in the Santa Clarita Valley Consolidated Traffic Model (SCVCTM), which is used by Los Angeles County to determine future roadway improvements for the Santa Clarita Valley. This network has been designed to accommodate both local and cumulative traffic from within and outside the B&T District.

The primary road network for the District consists of eleven arterials which are classified as Major, Secondary, or Limited Secondary Highways on the Los Angeles County Santa Clarita Valley Area Wide Circulation Plan and the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

This report analyzes build-out development of the District and identifies the scope of District improvements. The District proposes to provide full mitigation for all roadways identified on the Los Angeles County Santa Clarita Valley Area Wide Circulation Plan and the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan including intersections and interchanges. These roadways are The Old Road, Commerce Center Drive, Chiquito Canyon Road (from

SR-126 to I-CCR-1), Henry Mayo Drive, Long Canyon Road, Magic Mountain Parkway, Pico Canyon Road, Potrero Valley Road, State Route 126, and Wolcott Way. In accordance with the "Val Verde Agreement" which was approved as part of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, Chiquito Canyon Road is not proposed to be improved beyond I-CCR-1.

Full mitigation improvements will include full-width grading, base, pavement, curb, gutter, sidewalks, medians, striping for capacity enhancement, bus turnouts or bus pads (where applicable), bike lanes (where applicable), fully improved and signalized intersections, signal interconnect (where applicable), street lighting, roadway-related utility relocation, drainage structures within road right-of-way, full improvements for bridges and interchanges, and slope stabilization landscape for roadway-related cut/fill slopes.

Right of-way is assumed to be dedicated by individual development projects, except for State highway projects and roadway widening or roadway construction that are unrelated to private development projects.

Below is a list of proposed District improvements. The improvements, which are depicted on Figure 2, Proposed Improvements, have been planned to accommodate forecasted traffic growth occurring both within the District and cumulative traffic from outside the District. Additionally, the extent of improvements is described in the cost estimates included as Attachment B.

**Table 2: List of Improvements**

| LINKS                         |  |   |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| LINK#                         | LOCATION   | IMPROVEMENT   |
| <b>MAGIC MOUNTAIN PARKWAY</b> |  |   |
| MMP-1                         | Magic Mountain Parkway:<br>from west of The Old Road<br>to Westridge Parkway | Construct 6-lane major highway<br>beyond its current terminus |
| MMP-2                         | Magic Mountain Parkway:<br>from Westridge Parkway to<br>I-MMP-7              | Construct 4-lane secondary<br>highway                         |

| <b>LINKS</b>                 |  |                                       |
|------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| <b>LINK#</b>                 | <b>LOCATION</b>  | <b>IMPROVEMENT</b>                    |
| MMP-3                        | Magic Mountain Parkway:<br>from I-MMP-7 to I-MMP-10                      | Construct 4-lane secondary<br>highway |
| MMP-4                        | Magic Mountain Parkway:<br>from I-MMP-10 to I-MMP-12                     | Construct 4-lane secondary<br>highway |
| MMP-5                        | Magic Mountain Parkway:<br>from I-MMP-12 to Valencia<br>Boulevard        | Construct 4-lane secondary<br>highway |
| <b>VALENCIA BOULEVARD</b>    |  |                                       |
| VB-1                         | Valencia Blvd.: from I-VB-1<br>to Magic Mountain Parkway                 | Construct 4-lane secondary<br>highway |
| VB-2                         | Valencia Blvd.: from Magic<br>Mountain Parkway to I-VB-5                 | Construct 4-lane secondary<br>highway |
| <b>LONG CANYON ROAD</b>      |  |                                       |
| LCR-1                        | Long Canyon Road: from<br>SR-126 to I-LCR-2<br>(excludes bridge)         | Construct 6-lane major highway        |
| LCR-Bridge                   | Long Canyon Road Bridge<br>over Santa Clara River                        | Construct 6-lane Bridge               |
| LCR-2                        | Long Canyon Road: from<br>southerly Long Canyon<br>Road bridge to I-VB-1 | Construct 4-lane secondary<br>highway |
| <b>COMMERCE CENTER DRIVE</b> |  |                                       |
| CCD-B                        | Commerce Center Drive<br>Bridge over the Santa Clara<br>River            | Construct 6-lane bridge               |

| <b>LINKS</b>                |  |   |
|-----------------------------|--|---|
| <b>LINK#</b>                | <b>LOCATION</b>  | <b>IMPROVEMENT</b>  |
| CCD-1                       | Commerce Center Drive:<br>from southern bridge to<br>Magic Mountain Parkway  | Construct 6-lane major highway  |
| <b>CHIQUITO CANYON ROAD</b> |  |   |
| CCR-1                       | Chiquito Canyon Road: from<br>SR-126 to I-CCR-1                              | Construct 4-lane secondary<br>highway   |
| <b>THE OLD ROAD</b>         |  |   |
| TOR-1                       | The Old Road: from I-5<br>southbound ramps to<br>northerly bridge            | Vertical realignment and road<br>widening from 4 to 6 lanes, add<br>median, add Class I bike lane                         |
| TOR-B                       | The Old Road Bridge over<br>Santa Clara River                                | 4-lane bridge to be replaced with<br>new 6-lane bridge  |
| TOR-1A                      | The Old Road: from<br>southerly bridge to north of<br>Magic Mountain Parkway | Vertical realignment and road<br>widening from 4 to 6 lanes, add<br>median  |
| TOR-2                       | The Old Road: from I-5<br>southbound ramps north to<br>I-TOR-2               | Widen road from 4 to 6 lanes, add<br>median and Class I bike lane   |
| TOR-3                       | The Old Road: from I-TOR-2<br>north to SR-126                                | Widen road from 5 to 6 lanes and<br>construct median. Complete curb,<br>gutter and sidewalk improvements<br>on west side. |
| TOR-4                       | The Old Road: from SR-126<br>to Thornton Lane                                | Widen road from 4 to 6 lanes, add<br>median   |
| TOR-5                       | The Old Road: From<br>Biscailuz Drive to Live Oak<br>Road                    | Widen road from 2 to 4 lanes  |

| <b>LINKS</b>               |  |   |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| <b>LINK#</b>               | <b>LOCATION</b>  | <b>IMPROVEMENT</b>  |
| TOR-5B                     | The Old Road bridge over Castaic Creek   | Construct new 4-lane bridge   |
| <b>RYE CANYON ROAD</b>     |  |   |
| RCR-1                      | Rye Canyon Road: from The Old Road to Avenue Stanford  | Construct Additional Westbound Lane   |
| <b>POTRERO VALLEY ROAD</b> |  |   |
| PVR-1                      | Potrero Valley Road  | Construct new 4-lane roadway  |
| PVR-B                      | Potrero Valley Road Bridge over Santa Clara River  | Construct new 4-lane bridge   |
| PVR-2                      | Potrero Valley Road  | Construct new 4-lane roadway  |
| PVR-3                      | Potrero Valley Road  | Construct new 4-lane roadway  |
| <b>HENRY MAYO DRIVE</b>    |  |   |
| HMD-1                      | Henry Mayo Drive from The Old Road to I-HMD-1 (the remaining portion of HMD is being constructed with Commerce Center Drive Interchange project) | Construct new 4-lane roadway to <input type="checkbox"/> Parkway <input type="checkbox"/> Standards |

| <b>INTERSECTIONS</b>  |  |   |
|-----------------------|--|---|
| <b>INTERSECTION #</b> | <b>LOCATION</b>  | <b>IMPROVEMENT</b>  |
| I-TOR-1               | The Old Road and Rye Canyon Road                                   | 3-way Intersection Augmentation                                       |
| I-TOR-2               | The Old Road at Future Entrada Entrance                            | New 3-way Intersection  |
| I-TOR-3               | The Old Road at Commercial Center Entrance/Future Entrada Entrance | New 4-way Intersection  |
| I-TOR-4               | The Old Road at Henry Mayo Drive                                   | New 3-way Intersection and striping                                   |
| I-TOR-5               | The Old Road at Thornton Lane                                      | New 3-way Intersection  |
| I-TOR-6               | The Old Road at Skyview Lane                                       | New 4-way Intersection  |
| I-TOR-7               | The Old Road at I-5 Southbound Ramps                               | 3-way Intersection Augmentation                                       |
| I-TOR-8               | The Old Road at Turnberry Lane                                     | New 3-way Intersection  |
| I-TOR-9               | The Old Road at Stevenson Ranch/McBean Parkway                     | Stripe a 3rd southbound through lane and a westbound right-turn lane. |
| I-MMP-1               | Magic Mountain Parkway and The Old Road                            | Striping  |
| I-MMP-2               | Magic Mountain Parkway and The Media Center                        | New 4-way intersection  |
| I-MMP-3               | Magic Mountain Parkway and Magic Mountain Theme Park Entrance      | New 3-way intersection  |
| I-MMP-4               | Magic Mountain Parkway and future Entrada                          | New 3-way intersection  |



| <b>INTERSECTIONS</b>  |  |                        |
|-----------------------|--|------------------------|
| <b>INTERSECTION #</b> | <b>LOCATION</b>  | <b>IMPROVEMENT</b>     |
|                       | Entrance   |                        |
| I-MMP-5               | Magic Mountain Parkway and Commerce Center Drive           | New 3-way intersection |
| I-MMP-6               | Magic Mountain Parkway and Westridge Parkway               | New 4-way intersection |
| I-MMP-7               | Magic Mountain Parkway and future Mission Village Entrance | New 3-way intersection |
| I-MMP-8               | Magic Mountain Parkway and future Mission Village Entrance | New 4-way intersection |
| I-MMP-9               | Magic Mountain Parkway and future Mission Village Entrance | New 3-way intersection |
| I-MMP-10              | Magic Mountain Parkway and future Homestead Entrance       | New 3-way intersection |
| I-MMP-11              | Magic Mountain Parkway and future Homestead Entrance       | New 3-way intersection |
| I-MMP-12              | Magic Mountain Parkway and future Homestead Entrance       | New 3-way intersection |
| I-MMP-13              | Magic Mountain Parkway and future Homestead Entrance       | New 4-way intersection |
| I-MMP-14              | Magic Mountain Parkway and future Homestead Entrance       | New 3-way intersection |
| I-MMP-15              | Magic Mountain Parkway                                     | New 3-way intersection |

| <b>INTERSECTIONS</b>  |   |                        |
|-----------------------|---|------------------------|
| <b>INTERSECTION #</b> | <b>LOCATION</b>   | <b>IMPROVEMENT</b>     |
|                       | and Valencia Boulevard  |                        |
| I-CCD-1               | Commerce Center Drive<br>and future Entrada Village                     | New 3-way intersection |
| I-CCD-2               | Commerce Center Drive<br>and future Mission<br>Village/Entrada Entrance | New 4-way intersection |
| I-CCD-3               | Commerce Center Drive<br>and future Mission Village<br>Entrance         | New 3-way intersection |
| I-LCR-1               | Long Canyon Road and<br>future Landmark Village<br>Entrance             | New 4-way intersection |
| I-LCR-2               | Long Canyon Road and<br>future Homestead Village<br>Entrance            | New 4-way intersection |
| I-LCR-3               | Long Canyon Road and<br>future Homestead Village<br>Entrance            | New 3-way intersection |
| I-LCR-4               | Long Canyon Road and<br>future Homestead Village<br>Entrance            | New 3-way intersection |
| I-VB-1                | Valencia Boulevard and<br>future Homestead Village<br>Entrance          | New 3-way intersection |
| I-VB-2                | Valencia Boulevard and<br>future Homestead Village<br>Entrance          | New 3-way intersection |
| I-VB-3                | Valencia Boulevard and<br>future Homestead Village<br>Entrance          | New 3-way intersection |
| I-VB-4                | Valencia Boulevard and<br>future Homestead Village                      | New 3-way intersection |

| <b>INTERSECTIONS</b>  |  |  |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| <b>INTERSECTION #</b> | <b>LOCATION</b>  | <b>IMPROVEMENT</b>                     |
|                       | Entrance   |  |
| I-W-16                | Commerce Center Drive and Hasley Canyon Road               | Improvements complete                  |
| I-W-17                | Commerce Center Drive and Industry Drive                   | Improvements complete                  |
| I-W-18                | Commerce Center Drive and Witherspoon Parkway              | New 3-way signal and striping          |
| I-W-19                | Commerce Center Drive and Harrison Parkway                 | New 3-way signal and striping          |
| I-W-20                | Commerce Center Drive and Franklin Parkway                 | Convert 3-way to 4-way intersection    |
| I-W-21                | Commerce Center Drive and Hancock Parkway                  | New 4-way intersection and striping    |
| I-CCR-1               | Chiquito Canyon Road and future Homestead Village Entrance | New 3-way intersection                 |
| I-CCR-2               | Chiquito Canyon Road and future Homestead Village Entrance | New 4-way intersection                 |
| I-PVR-1               | Potrero Valley Road and Future Potrero Valley Entrance     | New 4-way intersection                 |
| I-HMD-1               | Henry Mayo Drive and future roadway                        | New 4-way intersection                 |
| I-HMD-2               | Henry Mayo Drive at Commerce Center Drive                  | Modify three-way intersection to 4-way |

| <b>INTERSECTIONS</b>  |   |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| <b>INTERSECTION #</b> | <b>LOCATION</b>                             | <b>IMPROVEMENT</b>   |
| <b>SR-126</b>         |   |  |
| SR-1                  | SR-126 and County Line                      | Construct eastbound right-turn lane and intersection approaches to the south   |
| SR-1A                 | SR-126 and County Line                      | Construct westbound right-turn lane and intersection approaches to the north   |
| SR-2                  | SR-126 and Long Canyon/Chiquito Canyon Road | Construct 4-way intersection. Widen median to allow double left-turns.         |
| SR-3                  | SR-126 and Wolcott Way                      | Construct south side of intersection   |
| SR-5                  | SR-126 and Wolcott Way                      | Construct north side of intersection. Widen median to allow double left-turns. |
| SR-6                  | SR-126 and Future Homestead Entrance        | Construct new 3-way intersection   |
| SR-7                  | SR-126 and San Martinez Grande Canyon Road  | Construct new 3-way intersection   |

### **INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS**

In addition to the improvements listed in Table 2 above, the following I-5 interchange improvements are proposed to be included in the District:

#### **Valencia Boulevard/ I-5 Interchange (southbound ramps) – Interchange #11**

Convert second westbound right turn lane to a shared westbound through/westbound right turn lane (improvement requires striping only).

### **Hasley Canyon Road / I-5 – Interchange #3**

At Hasley Canyon Road/I-5, the existing diamond interchange has been converted to a modern roundabout interchange. Roundabouts have been designed at the I-5 southbound and northbound ramps to provide adequate intersection capacity for future traffic. A westerly roundabout provides traffic circulation for the southbound on- and off-ramps, The Old Road, and Hasley Canyon Road. The easterly roundabout provides traffic circulation for the northbound ramps and Hasley Canyon Road. The I-5 Castaic Creek Bridge was widened and seismically retrofitted. Second southbound hook ramps and a signal were added at Sedona Way.

### **Magic Mountain Parkway Phase 2 Interchange – Interchange #8**


The Interstate 5/Magic Mountain Parkway Phase 2 project includes the reconstruction of the four northbound and southbound ramps and the relocation of the Old Road approximately 180 feet to the west. It includes the widening of the Old Road to its ultimate width from the Edison easement on the south to Feedmill Road to the north, transitioning back to the existing bridge over the Santa Clara River. It includes the widening of Magic Mountain Parkway from Tourney Road, under the new freeway overpass, and transitions back to existing roadway westerly of The Old Road intersection. As part of this project, the Chevron station will be relocated to the new site that has been graded behind the existing station.

### **Long Canyon Road/Chiquito Canyon Road / SR-126 (UGS) – Interchange #20**


This "urban grade separation" is a tight diamond grade separated interchange with Long Canyon Road/Chiquito Canyon Road going underneath a 6-lane SR126 overpass. The eastbound on- and off- ramps and the westbound on ramps are two lanes each. The westbound off ramp is three lanes, one right turn and two left turns. Right-of-way in Landmark Village has been set aside to accommodate this improvement.

### **Commerce Center Drive / SR-126 – Interchange #4**

The Commerce Center / SR-126 interchange proposes a full-movement, grade-separated interchange at the existing SR-126/ Commerce Center Drive intersection. This improvement also proposes the widening of SR-126 3,412 feet east of the intersection with Commerce Center Drive to 2,789 feet west of the intersection. As part of the proposed improvements, Henry Mayo Drive will be realigned to the south to create a signalized intersection with Commerce Center Drive. The Travel Village entrance will be relocated and signalized as part of the proposed improvements.



**FIGURE 2**  
**PROPOSED LINKS, BRIDGES**  
**AND INTERCHANGES**  
**WESTSIDE B&T DISTRICT**  
**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**



DATE: 09-27-2010

REVISED ON: 01-11-2011

SHEET 1 OF 1



## **IV. THE WESTSIDE BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICT**

### ***A. THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY***

The legal description of the District (Area of Benefit) is included as Attachment A. It encompasses those properties which have yet to be developed and which will receive benefit from the improvements funded by the District. A map showing the location of the District is included as Figure 1. The boundaries were determined by the topographical features in the Westside area, ownership/parcel lines, national forest land boundaries, and existing and future access.

#### **GENERAL BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION**

##### **West Boundary Line**

Generally follows the Los Angeles/Ventura County lines.

##### **North Boundary Line**

SR-126 to Chiquito Canyon Road and then northeast from the SR-126/Chiquito Canyon Road intersection, generally following recorded subdivision boundaries, ownership lines, and section lines to I-5.

##### **East Boundary Line**

Generally follows The Golden State Freeway.

##### **South Boundary Line**

The southern boundary of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, generally following recorded subdivision boundaries, ownership lines, and section lines.

### ***B. DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS***

Considerable future development is expected within the District and can be measured in terms of FDUs. The Quantity of FDUs was estimated for all vacant land within the District. Where a map has been filed, but not recorded, to develop vacant land, the FDUs were calculated from the residential development units and non-residential acreage specified in the filed map.



The quantity of FDUs for remaining vacant land was determined based on tentative tract or parcel maps filed with Los Angeles County or based on General Plan designations where no map has been filed.

Table 3, Development Analysis, depicts the calculation of FDUs, including applicable land use categories, estimated number of units/acres, and trip factors.

**Table 3: Development Analysis**

| <b>Land Use Category</b>      | <b>Estimated Number of Units/Estimated Number of Acres</b> | <b>Trip Factor</b> | <b>Factored Development Units</b> |
|-------------------------------|--|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Residential:</b>           |  |                    |                                   |
| Single Family                 | 5,089  | 1.0                | 5,089                             |
| Multi Family (Townhome/Condo) | 10,991   | 0.8                | 8,792.8                           |
| Multi Family (Apartment)*     | 6,975  | 0.7                | 4,882.5                           |
| <b>Non-Residential</b>        |  |                    |                                   |
| Commercial                    | 479  | 5                  | 2,395                             |
| Industrial                    | 282.6  | 3                  | 847.8                             |
| <b>TOTAL:</b>                 |  |                    | <b>22,007</b>                     |

### ***C. PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS AND ESTIMATED COSTS***

Improvements to be funded by the District are based on a determination of the traffic needs of future development anticipated by the County General Plan and analysis of the improvements designated on the highway plans of the adopted Los Angeles County Santa Clarita Valley Area Wide Circulation Plan. Improvements and associated costs have been estimated for purposes of determining the District fee rates. Actual scope of work and costs may change as the improvements approach the final design stage. The proposed improvements, estimated to cost approximately \$525.6 Million are shown in Figure 2.

Estimated costs of District improvements include construction costs based on prevailing wage, cost of materials, design costs and permitting fees (considered soft costs, shown in Table 4 below), and an administrative/management fee equal to 5% of the wage, materials and soft costs.

**Table 4: Soft Cost Percentages**

| Description                             | Intersection | Storm Drain  | Road         | Bridge       | State Hwys.  |              |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|   |              |              |              |              | Road         | Interchanges |
| Engineering-Design                      | 9.5%         | 6%           | 4%           | 7%           | 8%           | 7%           |
| Plan Check                              | 3%           | 2.5%         | 2%           | 2%           | 3%           | 3%           |
| Engineering-Field                       | 3%           | 1%           | 2%           | 2%           | 7%           | 3%           |
| Survey                                  | 3%           | 3%           | 2%           | 2%           | 8%           | 2.5%         |
| Soils                                   | 1%           | 1%           | 3%           | 2%           | 7%           | 1%           |
| Geology                                 | 0%           | 0%           | 0.5%         | 0.5%         | 0.5%         | 0%           |
| Bonds/Fees                              | 1%           | 8%           | 8%           | 5.5%         | 10%          | 1%           |
| Erosion Control (SWPPP)                 | 0.0%         | 0%           | 0.5%         | 0%           | 0.5%         | 0.5%         |
| Army Corps/Fish & Game-Env. Inspections | 0%           | 0%           | 0%           | 1%           | 0%           | 0%           |
| <b>TOTAL:</b>                           | <b>20.5%</b> | <b>21.5%</b> | <b>22.0%</b> | <b>22.0%</b> | <b>44.0%</b> | <b>18%</b>   |

#### ***D. IMPROVEMENT PHASING***

Generally, the timing and phasing of construction of District improvements will be determined by when and where development occurs, as well as how many units. The amount of funds received may also determine the timing of improvements.

#### ***E. TRAFFIC AND LAND USE ANALYSIS***

The existing highway system adequately handles the traffic generated by existing development located within the District. As such, existing development would not require the additional highway improvements if additional development did not occur. Therefore, the improvements identified in this report are intended to accommodate the circulation needs of future development within the District and are expected to improve circulation for future development within the District. Regional improvements within, or funded by, this District are expected to improve circulation for future development on a Valley-wide basis.

It is estimated that an additional 23,055 residential units and 761.6 acres of non-residential area will be developed within the District. The anticipated development quantified in the Development Analysis section and categorized above will require an expanded circulation system.

#### **F. THE DISTRICT FEE**

The District fee is calculated by dividing the estimated net cost of the remaining improvements by the estimated number of FDUs. The net cost is the total estimated cost of improvements less anticipated grant funding and funds available. The calculated District fee is shown below:

**Table 5: District Fee Calculation**

|   |   |                      |
|---|---|----------------------|
| A | <u>LINKS</u>  | \$352,165,760        |
| B | <u>INTERSECTIONS</u>  | \$37,570,729         |
| C | <u>INTERCHANGES</u>   | \$135,837,986        |
| D | <u>DISTRICT UPDATE COSTS</u>                                  | \$49,500             |
| E | <b>TOTAL DISTRICT COSTS (ROW A+B+C+D)</b>                     | <b>\$525,623,975</b> |
| F | <b>Existing Funds In District - LA County</b>                 | <b>\$482,350</b>     |
| G | <b>Existing Credits In District - LA County</b>               | <b>\$5,891,280</b>   |
| H | <b>Signal Agreements- LCs to be released (reduces credit)</b> | <b>\$1,125,732</b>   |
| J | <b>Approximate Anticipated Outside Funding</b>                | <b>\$59,000,000</b>  |
|   | <b>TOTAL NET COST OF DISTRICT (ROW E - F + G - H-J)</b>       | <b>\$470,907,173</b> |
|   | District FDUs   | 22,007               |
|   | <b>Cost per FDU</b>   | <b>\$21,400</b>      |

To ensure equity of District fee assignment, the proposed District fee is proportionate to the degree to which future developments benefit from the proposed improvements. Therefore, the proportionate shares take into account

the impacts of peak-hour vehicle trips on the system as identified in the Los Angeles County Circulation Plan. Each of the five major land use categories have been assigned FDUs based on the average impact for that category relative to a single-family residence as shown below:

- Single Family ..... 1.0 FDU
- Condo/Townhome (>20 du/ac) ..... 0.8 FDU
- Apartment (<20 du/ac) ..... 0.7 FDU
- Commercial (per gross acre) ..... 5.0 FDUs
- Industrial (per gross acre) ..... 3.0 FDUs

Future development units and/or acres are multiplied by the assigned FDUs and multiplied by the District's adopted District fee per FDU resulting in a project's proportionate share of District fees. The District fees for each of the five major land use categories are included in Table 1.

The adoption of this type of funding district does not levy any fees against existing development. FDUs for recorded subdivisions, which are located within the District, were not included in the District fee calculation, as it has been assumed that District fees were paid at recordation. If District fees were not paid at recordation for non-residential land uses, then District fees may be collected for the issuance of a building permit.

## **SPECIAL CASES**

### Governmental Uses

Governmental improvements, such as those for schools, police, fire protection, and libraries, specifically needed to support benefited development, have been excluded from the development analysis as these uses are assumed to be exempt from District payment.

### Lands with Physical Development Constraints

Lands with physical development constraints such as landslides, faults, or other restricted use areas, were considered for future development according to their County-assigned land use. This assumption was made since, in many cases, these types of constraints can be mitigated. Furthermore, these restricted use areas can often be used to accommodate development features such as parking lots and setbacks, and residential densities or non-residential square footage can often be transferred from landslide areas to other developable portions of a site.

### Mixed Use (Residential and Commercial)

Within the District there are proposed development areas that include both residential and commercial uses on the same lot. These "mixed use" areas cannot collect fees base on a single use of the lot as is typical for fee collection in most all other cases. Therefore, fee collection for these uses shall be as outlined henceforth. Fees for residential uses on mixed use lots shall be based on number of units multiplied by the appropriate factor (e.g. 0.8 FDU/unit for condos, 0.7 FDU/unit for apartments), then multiplied by the fee in effect at the time of the project's map recordation. Fees for the non-residential area shall be based on the building square footage divided by 43,560, then multiplied by a factor of 5, then multiplied by the fee in effect at the time of the project's map recordation.

#### Assisted Living Facilities

The District includes assisted-living facility uses. Fees for this type of use are to be collected at a commercial rate, based on the gross acreage of the associated lot(s), as opposed to number of units.

#### Non-Residential Land Development not including a Land Division

The County code regarding bridge and major thoroughfare fee payment allows for the collection of B&T fees at either the map recordation or building permit phases of a project. It is the County's policy to collect only at the map recordation unless no land division is proposed. District fees for land development not including a land division shall be paid prior to the issuance of a building permit.

District fees for non-residential uses that are part of a land division will be calculated based on the gross acreage of each non-residential lot.

District fees for non-residential uses on a vacant parcel that does not include a land division will be calculated based on the gross acreage within the vacant parcel's boundary.

District fees for non-residential uses on an under-utilized parcel that does not include a land division will be calculated, at the discretion of the County, based on one of the following calculations:

#### *Retail Commercial*

$$\text{Total District Fee Obligation} = \frac{\text{Gross building square footage}}{16,335} * 5 * \text{District Fee per FDU}$$

A typical fee calculation of FDUs for a retail commercial development involving a land division would assume gross commercial lot acreage times 5 FDUs times the District fee per FDU. However, the above calculation determines the District fee obligation by estimating the gross project acreage based on a proposed building's gross square footage and an assumed Floor Area Ratio (FAR). For example, using an FAR of 0.375:1, a retail commercial building on a one-acre (43,560 square feet) parcel would yield a building square footage of 16,335 ( $43,560 \times 0.375 = 16,335$ ). Therefore, if a lease project is submitted for District fee payment, an assumed gross acreage can be determined by taking the building's gross square footage and dividing it by 16,335, which has previously been established as generally being one acre of retail development.

*Office Commercial/Business Park*

$$\text{Total District Fee Obligation} = \frac{\text{Gross building square footage}}{43,560} * 5 * \text{District Fee per FDU}$$

Using an FAR of 1.0:1, an office commercial or business park building on a one-acre (43,560 square feet) parcel would yield a building square footage of 43,560 ( $43,560 * 1 = 43,560$ ). Again, if a lease project is submitted for District fee payment, an assumed gross acreage can be determined by taking the building's gross square footage and dividing it by 43,560, essentially one acre of commercial office development.

*Industrial*

$$\text{Total District Fee Obligation} = \frac{\text{Gross building square footage}}{29,403} * 3 * \text{District Fee per FDU}$$

Using an FAR of 0.675:1, industrial buildings on a one-acre parcel would yield a building square footage of 29,403 ( $43,560 * 0.675 = 29,403$ ). Again, if a lease project is submitted for District fee payment, an assumed gross acreage can be determined by taking the building's gross square footage and dividing it by 29,403, essentially one acre for industrial development.

District fees for a lease building are not required if the underlying land paid District fees based on gross acreage, including the land on which the lease building is to be sited. It should be noted that if a project proposes an upgraded use from that which was paid for the underlying parcel (e.g. commercial use proposed by fees at recordation were paid based on industrial rate), that project would be subject to the difference in fees between that which was paid and the proposed use.

Underutilized parcels such as those that may accommodate a future lease structure were not assumed in the development analysis, as these parcels are difficult to identify.

### Non-Typical Cases

The County may develop and have on file a rate sheet for non-typical land uses that do not fit the generally adopted fee rate categories. Special calculations for non-typical land uses may also be considered at the discretion of the County.

## **G. CONSTRUCTION OF DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS IN LIEU OF PAYING FEES**

If a developer constructs District-identified improvements prior to map recordation, that developer becomes eligible for District credit which can be used to offset District fee payments. If the cost of the completed and accepted improvements, along with the soft costs and 5% administrative/management fee, exceeds the District fee obligation, the developer would be given a credit, after improvement completion and acceptance, which can be used to offset future District fee obligations within the District.

If adequate funds are available, the developer may receive a cash reimbursement, as outlined in Section H below.

Thus, a developer has the following options with regard to construction of District-identified improvements:

- Construct District-identified improvements for District credit.
- Construct District-identified improvements and receive cash reimbursement from the District, if adequate funds are available. Implementation of prevailing wages<sup>1</sup> labor is required for the construction of District improvements in order for a developer to receive cash reimbursement from the District.<sup>1</sup>

If construction of a District-identified improvement is underway prior to the related project's final map recordation, a surety bond will be posted to secure the improvement's completion. In such cases, no fees shall be due at final map recordation as long as the value of the surety bond is equal to, or greater than, the amount of fees otherwise due.

## **H. CREDIT AWARD AND CASH REIMBURSEMENT**

---

<sup>1</sup> Prevailing wages is defined as the commonly accepted rate paid to workers practicing in the same or similar locality under the same or similar circumstances.

Credit is awarded upon review and approval of the costs to implement a District project based on supporting documentation submitted by the developer. Generally credit is awarded after project completion and acceptance. However, the County may issue credits at an earlier stage (nearly complete) if the cost documentation is acceptable.

The County, in its discretion, may elect to provide cash reimbursement for District credits. The determination of whether or not to provide cash reimbursement for District credits will generally be made in accordance with the following guidelines:

1. The County may determine to make loans to a particular District from non-District sources (e.g. County General Fund) or from other Districts. If a loan has been made to a particular District, no reimbursement of District credits will be made from that District until the loan(s) have been repaid by that District.
2. The County may determine to set aside previously collected funds or earmark funds to be collected for the construction of a particular B&T project or projects within a District. District funds that have been set aside or earmarked for a particular B&T project will be excluded from consideration as a source of funds for reimbursement of District credits.
3. In general, credits will be reimbursed according to the chronological order in which credits were granted, i.e. older outstanding credits will generally be reimbursed prior to credits that were granted more recently.
4. The County may elect to reimburse a block of credit holders at the same time. In this case, all outstanding credit holders with the same or earlier credit dates will be reimbursed an equal amount.
5. Where a particular District has previously loaned funds to another District, the County will generally attempt to make all funds repaid to the lending District available for credit reimbursement in accordance with Item Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 above.
6. Nothing in Items Nos. 1 to 5 above should be interpreted as requiring the County to provide reimbursement at any given time. The County may elect to continue to accumulate funds in order to fund planned projects.

If a developer constructs improvements beyond its conditioned obligation, District credit and/or cash may be given subsequent to the improvement's completion and acceptance as long as the improvement has been described in this report as a District improvement.



## ***I. RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION***

If a condition of project approval requires a landowner to dedicate property as right of way for a State improvement, then the landowner will receive credit at fair market value for the property dedicated. If any local improvement requires land acquisitions from a third party, the cost of the property will be added to the estimated cost of the improvement for District credit. However, if right-of-way is required to be dedicated for a County improvement, as a condition of project approval, the landowner receives no credit for the value of the dedicated property. Therefore, the cost estimates prepared for District improvement reflect costs for right-of-way as described above.

## ***J. PROVISIONS FOR UPDATING COSTS AND UNIT INFORMATION***

Projections for build-out development and the cost of the improvements located within the area of benefit may change over time. Project scope may change due to refinement and the need to comply with requirements imposed by other agencies, including, but not limited to, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). A reasonable amount of outside funding has been anticipated and formulated into the proposed District fees. Outside funding, not anticipated in the District formation analysis or update, may be received or funds anticipated may not be received. Therefore, in order to equitably assess future development as well as collect sufficient funds to complete the improvements, it will be necessary to periodically re-evaluate the net cost of the improvements, the remaining land to be developed and the type of development being constructed within the District and to adjust the fee accordingly.

Beginning July 1, 2012, and thereafter each succeeding July 1, the District fees shall be adjusted as follows: calculate the percentage movement for the previous year in the Los Angeles Regional Construction Cost Index (CCI) based on Engineering News Record data for that period. Then, if the percentage movement equals or exceeds a five percent increase, the District fee per FDU will be increased by five percent and rounded up to the nearest \$10. If the percentage movement increases less than five percent, the District fee per FDU will be increased by the same percent as the percentage movement and rounded up to the nearest \$10. In the event that there is a negative adjustment in the CCI, then the fee shall be adjusted downward by up to five percent.

A separate biennial review to reassess development trends, construction costs, grant funding success, and refinement of project scope will also be conducted.

**K.     *PROPOSAL FOR DISTRICT CLOSURE***

In the event that District fees collected from developers exceed the cost of improvements, the surplus funds, less administrative costs, will be refunded at District closure by the County to current owners in proportion to District fees paid.

**L.     *DISTRICT FUNDS***

The County will maintain a separate District Fund for the Westside District. Funds may be loaned to or from the Westside District provided that the loans are properly recorded by no less than a Resolution approved by the Board of Supervisors. The County shall make all funds or credits available to the District, as necessary, for the purpose of reimbursing or providing credit to developers/landowners, as outlined in this report, once the improvements are completed, accepted, and the proper documentation filed with the reimbursement request.

To receive credit for constructed and approved improvements, the proper documentation must be submitted to the County. No documentation for soft costs is necessary as they are already accounted for in the District fees.

Improvements will be accepted for maintenance by the County upon completion and field acceptance. After field acceptance of constructed improvements, credit withdrawal of District funds is authorized. Along with the "B&T Cash/Credit Request Form" included as Attachment E, copies of contracts, change orders, and purchase orders which detail construction costs will be provided to the County. Upon submittal of a request for the withdrawal of credits due, review and determination by the County will be completed within 30 days.

**M.     *THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS***

The County of Los Angeles finds establishment of the proposed District Fees is statutorily exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act under Public Resource Code Section 21080 (b)(8)(D).

## **ATTACHMENT A – LEGAL DESCRIPTION**

### **LEGAL DESCRIPTION THE AREA OF BENEFIT KNOWN AS WESTSIDE BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICT**

That portion of the unincorporated territory of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, within the following described boundaries:

BEGINNING at the intersection of the westerly line of the County of Los Angeles, as shown on CSB 711-3 and the southerly line of Parcel 18 of Parcel Map No. 24500-01, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, as per map filed in Book 293, pages 34 through 67 inclusive of Parcel Maps, in the office of the County Recorder of said County:

- 1) Thence northwesterly along the southwesterly boundary of said County to the northwesterly corner of Lot 11 of Licensed Surveyor's Map recorded in Book 27 pages 24 to 26, in the office of the County Recorder of said County;
- 2) Thence easterly along the northerly line of said Licensed Surveyor's Map to the southeast corner of Lot 4 of Fractional Section 21, Township 4 North, Range 17 West, San Bernardino Meridian;
- 3) Thence northerly along the easterly lines of said Section 21 and Section 16, Township 4 North, Range 17 West, San Bernardino Meridian to the east quarter corner of said Section 16;
- 4) Thence westerly, northerly, and easterly along the southerly, westerly, and northerly lines of the northeast quarter of said Section 16 to the northeast corner of said Section 16;
- 5) Thence easterly along the southerly line of Section 10, Township 4 North, Range 17 West, San Bernardino Meridian to the southwest corner of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of said Section 10;
- 6) Thence northerly along the westerly line of said southeast quarter to the southwest corner of Tract No. 8599, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, as per map filed in Book 101 Pages 87 to 88 inclusive of Maps, in the office of the County Recorder of said County;
- 7) Thence northerly along the westerly boundary of said Tract No. 8599 to the south line of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of said Section 10;

- 8) Thence easterly and northerly along the southerly and easterly lines of said northwest quarter to the northeast corner of said northwest quarter;
- 9) Thence easterly along the southerly line of Section 3, Township 4 North, Range 17 West, San Bernardino Meridian to the Southeast corner of said Section 3;
- 10) Thence northerly along the easterly line of said Section 3 to the northerly right of way of Hasley Canyon Road as shown on County Surveyor's Map No. B-5149 filed May 19, 1972, in the office of the Director of Public Works of said County;
- 11) Thence easterly along the northerly right of way of said Hasley Canyon Road to the westerly most northwest corner of Tract No. 45084, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, as per map filed in Book 1254, pages 12 to 39 inclusive of Maps, in the office of the County Recorder of said County;
- 12) Thence easterly and northerly along the northerly and westerly boundary of said Tract No. 45084 to the northerly line of Section 2, Township 4 North, Range 17 West, San Bernardino Meridian;
- 13) Thence easterly along the northerly line of last said Section 2 and along the northerly line of Section 1, Township 4 North, Range 17 West, San Bernardino Meridian to a point of intersection with the easterly right-of-way of the Golden State Freeway, Interstate Route 5, as shown on County Surveyor's Filed Map No. 12010, page 4, on file in the office of the Director of Public Works of said County;
- 14) Thence southerly along said last mentioned easterly right of way to the northerly line of McBean Parkway as shown on Licensed Surveyor's Map recorded in Book 27, pages 41 to 43;
- 15) Thence westerly and southwesterly along the northerly and northwesterly line of McBean Parkway and Stevenson Ranch Parkway to the westerly line of Parcel Map No. 26010 filed in Book 305, pages 79 through 95 inclusive of Parcel Maps, in the office of the County Recorder of said County;
- 16) Thence northerly along the westerly line of said Parcel Map No. 26010 and along the westerly line of the land described in deed recorded July 30, 2004, as Instrument No. 04-1959179, and the westerly line of deed recorded May 1, 2003, as Instrument No. 03-1251507 and the westerly line of deed recorded July 30, 2004, as Instrument No. 04-1959178, all of Official Records, all records of said

County, and along the easterly, northerly and westerly lines of Parcel Map No. 15955 filed in Book 188 Pages 90 through 95 inclusive of Parcel Maps, in the office of the County Recorder of said County, to the southeast corner of said Parcel 18 of Parcel Map No. 24500-01;

- 17) Thence westerly, along the southerly boundary of said Parcel 18 to the point of beginning.

**ATTACHMENT B–SUMMARY OF COST ESTIMATES FOR DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS**

| <b>SUMMARY OF COST ESTIMATES FOR<br/>DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS</b> |              |
|--|--------------|
| <b>LINK –<br/>INTERSECTION-<br/>INTERCHANGE#</b>               | <b>COST</b>  |
| MMP-1  | \$12,127,878 |
| MMP-2  | \$5,638,591  |
| MMP-3  | \$9,846,230  |
| MMP-4  | \$13,619,404 |
| MMP-5  | \$10,510,806 |
| VB-1   | \$8,568,621  |
| VB-2   | \$8,835,553  |
| LCR-1  | \$4,090,073  |
| LCR-Bridge   | \$38,971,677 |
| LCR-2  | \$14,611,904 |
| CCD-B  | \$47,947,754 |
| CCD-1  | \$17,328,519 |
| CCR-1  | \$2,422,651  |
| TOR-1  | \$9,381,135  |
| TOR-B  | \$25,640,673 |
| TOR-1A   | \$1,809,934  |
| TOR-2  | \$3,680,880  |
| TOR-3  | \$6,886,615  |
| TOR-4  | \$1,250,354  |
| TOR-5  | \$8,845,529  |
| TOR-5B   | \$10,665,606 |
| RCR-1  | \$4,340,647  |
| HMD-1  | \$1,575,629  |
| PVR-1,2,3  | \$14,298,640 |
| PVR-B  | \$69,270,459 |
| I-TOR-1  | \$385,585    |
| I-TOR-2  | \$363,759    |
| I-TOR-3  | \$216,073    |

| <b>SUMMARY OF COST ESTIMATES FOR<br/>DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS</b> |             |
|--|-------------|
| <b>LINK –<br/>INTERSECTION-<br/>INTERCHANGE#</b>               | <b>COST</b> |
| I-TOR-4  | \$385,585   |
| I-TOR-5  | \$363,759   |
| I-TOR-6  | \$654,767   |
| I-TOR-7  | \$4,765,529 |
| I-TOR-8  | \$363,759   |
| I-TOR-9  | \$29,101    |
| I-MMP-1  | \$17,460    |
| I-MMP-2  | \$327,383   |
| I-MMP-3  | \$363,759   |
| I-MMP-4  | \$654,767   |
| I-MMP-5  | \$363,759   |
| I-MMP-6  | \$654,767   |
| I-MMP-7  | \$363,759   |
| I-MMP-8  | \$654,767   |
| I-MMP-9  | \$363,759   |
| I-MMP-10   | \$654,767   |
| I-MMP-11   | \$363,759   |
| I-MMP-12   | \$363,759   |
| I-MMP-13   | \$654,767   |
| I-MMP-14   | \$363,759   |
| I-MMP-15   | \$363,759   |
| I-HMD-1  | \$363,759   |
| I-HMD-2  | \$216,073   |
| I-CCD-1  | \$363,759   |
| I-CCD-2  | \$654,767   |
| I-CCD-3  | \$363,759   |
| I-LCR-1  | \$654,767   |
| I-LCR-2  | \$654,767   |
| I-LCR-3  | \$363,759   |
| I-LCR-4  | \$363,759   |

| <b>SUMMARY OF COST ESTIMATES FOR<br/>DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS</b> |               |
|--|---------------|
| <b>LINK –<br/>INTERSECTION-<br/>INTERCHANGE#</b>               | <b>COST</b>   |
| I-VB-1   | \$363,759     |
| I-VB-2   | \$363,759     |
| I-VB-3   | \$363,759     |
| I-VB-4   | \$363,759     |
| I-W-16   | \$293,076     |
| I-W-17   | \$339,308     |
| I-W-18   | \$363,759     |
| I-W-19   | \$363,759     |
| I-W-20   | \$216,073     |
| I-W-21   | \$654,767     |
| I-CCR-1  | \$363,759     |
| I-CCR-2  | \$654,767     |
| I-PVR-1  | \$654,767     |
| SR-1   | \$1,245,241   |
| SR-1A  | \$1,185,860   |
| SR-2   | \$1,556,155   |
| SR-3   | \$944,683     |
| SR-5   | \$5,151,148   |
| SR-6   | \$976,639     |
| SR-7   | \$3,096,089   |
| IC#3   | \$19,686,149  |
| IC#4   | \$60,050,303  |
| IC#8   | \$21,194,134  |
| IC#11  | \$356,213     |
| IC#20  | \$34,551,188  |
| TOTAL  | \$525,574,475 |



## ATTACHMENT C – DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS

| Map Number                      | Single-Family |             | Condo Units  |               | Multi-Family Units |               | Commercial    |               | Industrial    |               |
|---------------------------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|                                 | Units         | FDUs        | Units        | FDUs          | Units              | FDUs          | Ac.           | FDUs          | Ac.           | FDUs          |
| APN 2826-037-006                | 0             | 0           | 0            | 0             | 0                  | 0             | 2.26          | 11.3          | 0             | 0             |
| APN 2826-037-027                | 0             | 0           | 0            | 0             | 0                  | 0             | 1.73          | 8.65          | 0             | 0             |
| TR48007                         | 33            | 33          | 0            | 0             | 0                  | 0             | 0             | 0             | 0             | 0             |
| PM060734                        | 0             | 0           | 0            | 0             | 0                  | 0             | 0             | 0             | 11.54         | 34.62         |
| PM062336*                       | 0             | 0           | 0            | 0             | 0                  | 0             | 0             | 0             | 0             | 0             |
| PM18108                         | 0             | 0           | 0            | 0             | 0                  | 0             | 77.3          | 386.5         | 153.9         | 461.7         |
| PM24801                         | 0             | 0           | 0            | 0             | 0                  | 0             | 1.52          | 7.6           | 0             | 0             |
| TR060319                        | 0             | 0           | 35           | 28            | 0                  | 0             | 0             | 0             | 0             | 0             |
| TR061469*                       | 0             | 0           | 0            | 0             | 0                  | 0             | 0             | 0             | 0             | 0             |
| TR062000                        | 19            | 19          | 0            | 0             | 0                  | 0             | 0             | 0             | 0             | 0             |
| PM060030                        | 0             | 0           | 0            | 0             | 0                  | 0             | 0             | 0             | 117.12        | 351.36        |
| TR053108<br>(Landmark Village)  | 483           | 483         | 520          | 416           | 441                | 308.7         | 28.51         | 142.55        | 0             | 0             |
| TR053295<br>(Entrada South)     | 593           | 593         | 556          | 444.8         | 491                | 343.7         | 46.7          | 233.5         | 0             | 0             |
| Entrada North                   | 0             | 0           | 0            | 0             | 1713               | 1199.1        | 134.9         | 674.5         | 0             | 0             |
| TR060678<br>(Homestead Village) | 1109          | 1109        | 3190         | 2552          | 1478               | 1034.6        | 76            | 380           | 0             | 0             |
| TR061105<br>(Mission Village)   | 382           | 382         | 1738         | 1390.4        | 1941               | 1358.7        | 72.5          | 362.6         | 0             | 0             |
| TR061911<br>(Potrero Village)   | 2470          | 2470        | 4952         | 3961.6        | 911                | 637.7         | 37.6          | 188           | 0             | 0             |
| <b>TOTAL BY USE</b>             | <b>5089</b>   | <b>5089</b> | <b>10991</b> | <b>8792.8</b> | <b>6975</b>        | <b>4882.5</b> | <b>479.04</b> | <b>2395.2</b> | <b>282.56</b> | <b>847.68</b> |

**GRAND TOTAL FDUs 22,007.18**

\* It is assumed that resubdivision of land will not be subject to additional B&T fees as they were originally collected with the underlying map.

**ATTACHMENT D – COUNTY AND CITY CODES PERTAINING TO B&T DISTRICTS**

**TITLE 58    Chapter 21.23   §32.32.200**

**21.32.200 MAJOR THOROUGHFARE AND BRIDGE FEES.**

- A. A subdivider, as a condition of approval of a final map for property within an area of benefit, or a building permit applicant, as a condition of issuance of a building permit for property within an area of benefit, shall pay a fee as hereinafter established to defray the cost of constructing bridges over waterways, railways, freeways and canyons, and/or constructing major thoroughfares.
- B. Definitions.
1. *Area of benefit* means a specified area wherein it has been determined that the real property located herein will benefit from the construction of a bridge and/or major thoroughfare.
  2. *Bridge facility* means any crossing for a highway or local road, involving a railway, freeway, stream or canyon, which is required by the General Plan in order to accommodate new urban development within the area of benefit.
  3. *Construction* means and includes preliminary studies, design, acquisition of right-of-way, administration of construction contracts, and actual construction.
  4. *Major thoroughfare* means those roads designated in the transportation element of the General Plan, the primary purpose of which is to carry through traffic and provide a network connection to the state highway system.
  5. The singular number includes the plural, and the plural the singular.
- C. The provisions herein for payment of a fee shall apply only if the bridge and/or major thoroughfare has been included in an element of the General Plan adopted by the Board of Supervisors at least 30 days prior to the filing of a map or application for a building permit on land located within the boundaries of the area of benefit.
- D. Payment of fees shall not be required unless any major thoroughfares are in addition to, or a widening or reconstruction of, any existing major thoroughfares serving the area at the time of the adoption of the boundaries of the area of benefit.
- E. Payment of Fees shall not be required unless any planned bridge facility is a new bridge serving the area or an addition to an existing bridge facility serving the area at the time of the adoption of the boundaries of the area of benefit.

- F.
  - 1. Action to establish an area of benefit may be initiated by the Board of Supervisors upon its own motion or upon the recommendation of the Road Commissioner.
  - 2. The Board of Supervisors will set a public hearing for each proposed area of benefit. Notice of the time and place of said hearing, including preliminary information related to the boundaries of the area of benefit, estimated costs and the method of fee apportionment shall be given pursuant to Section 65905 of the Government Code.
- G.
  - 1. At the public hearing, the Board of Supervisors will consider the testimony, written protests and other evidence. At the conclusion of the public hearing, the Board of Supervisors may, unless a majority written protest is filed and not withdrawn, determine to establish an area of benefit. If established, the Board of Supervisors shall adopt a resolution describing the boundaries of the area of benefit, setting forth the cost, whether actual or estimated, and the method of fee apportionment. A certified copy of such resolution shall be recorded with the County Recorder.
  - 2. Such apportioned fees shall be applicable to all property within the area of benefit, and shall be payable as a condition of approval of a final map or as a condition of issuing a building permit for such property or portions thereof. Where the area of benefit includes lands not subject to the payment of fees pursuant to this section, the Board of Supervisors shall make provisions for payment of the share of improvement cost apportioned to such lands not subject to the payment of fees pursuant to this section, the Board of Supervisors shall make provisions for payment of the share of improvement cost apportioned to such lands from other sources.
  - 3. Written protest will be received by the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors at any time prior to the close of the public hearing. If written protests are filed by the owners of more than one-half of the area of the property to be benefited by the improvement and sufficient protests are not withdrawn to as to reduce the area represented by the protests to less than one-half of the area to be benefited, then the proposed proceedings shall be abandoned and the Board of Supervisors shall not, for one year from the filing of said written protests, commence or carry on any proceedings for the same improvement under the provisions of this section. Any protest may be withdrawn by the owner making the same, in writing, at any time prior to the close of the public hearing.

4. If any majority protest is directed against only a portion of the improvement, then all further proceedings under the provisions of this section to construct that portion of the improvement so protested against shall be barred for a period of one year, but the Board of Supervisors shall not be barred from commencing new proceedings not including any part of the improvement so protested against. Such proceedings shall be commenced by a new notice and public hearing as set forth in Subsection F above.
  5. Nothing in this section shall prohibit the Board of Supervisors, within such one-year period, from commencing and carrying on new proceedings for the construction of an improvement or portion of the improvement so protested against if it finds, by the affirmative vote of four-fifths of its members, that the owners of more than one-half of the area of the property to be benefited are in favor of going forward with such improvement or portion thereof.
- H. Fees paid pursuant to this section shall be deposited in a planned bridge facility and/or major thoroughfare fund. A fund shall be established for each planned bridge facility project and/or each planned major thoroughfare project. If the benefit area is one in which more than one bridge and/or major thoroughfare is required to be constructed, a separate fund may be established covering all of the bridge projects and/or major thoroughfares in the benefit area. Moneys in such fund shall be expended solely for the construction or reimbursement for construction of the improvement serving the area to be benefited and from which the fees comprising the fund were collected, or to reimburse the County for the costs of constructing the improvement.
- I. The Board of Supervisors may approve the acceptance of considerations in lieu of the payment of fees established herein.
- J. The Board of Supervisors may approve the advancement of money from the General Fund or Road Fund to pay the costs of constructing the improvements covered herein and may reimburse the General Fund or Road Fund for such advances from planned bridge facility and/or major thoroughfare funds established pursuant to this section.
- K. If a subdivider, as a condition of approval of a subdivision, is required or desires to construct a bridge and/or major thoroughfare, the Board of Supervisors may enter into a reimbursement agreement with the subdivider. Such agreement may provide for payments to the subdivider from the bridge facility and/or major

thoroughfare fund covering that specific project to reimburse the subdivider for costs not allocated to the subdivider's property in the resolution establishing the area of benefit. If the bridge and/or major thoroughfare fund covers more than one project, reimbursements shall be made on a pro-rata basis, reflecting the actual or estimated costs of the projects covered by the fund. (Ord. 82-0240 Sec. 1, 1982; Ord. 82-0050 Sec. 1, 1982)

**22.48.235. MAJOR BRIDGE AND THOROUGHFARE FEES.** Except as otherwise provided in Section 22.48.280, a building or structure shall not be used on any lot or parcel of land, any portion of which is located within a Bridge or Major Thoroughfare District established pursuant to Section 21.32.200, unless the required district fee has been paid as a condition of issuing a building permit.  
(Ord. 85-0168, Sec. 33)

**22.48280 EXEMPTIONS – EXISTING BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES.** This Part 4 does not apply to the use, alteration, or enlargement of an existing building or structure or the erection of one or more buildings or structures accessory thereto, or both, on the same lot or parcel of land, if the total value of such alteration, enlargement, or construction does not exceed one half of the current market value of all existing buildings or structures on such lot or parcel of land.  
(Ord. 1494 Ch. 4 Art. 4 & 497.1927.)

**ATTACHMENT E – B&T CASH/CREDIT REQUEST FORM**

IO#: \_\_\_\_\_  
**Project Request No:** \_\_\_\_\_

**B&T District  
Percentages:**

|                    |   |            |      |        |
|--------------------|---|------------|------|--------|
| Castaic District:  | % | Amount: \$ | Cash | Credit |
| Westside District: | % | Amount: \$ | Cash | Credit |
| Other District:    | % | Amount: \$ | Cash | Credit |

**Area Identification:**

Link #(s): \_\_\_\_\_ Intersection #(s): \_\_\_\_\_ Interchange #(s): \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Description:** \_\_\_\_\_

| ATTACHMENTS                                 | Yes | No | N/A |
|---|-----|----|-----|
| Signature Page                              |     |    |     |
| Applicable District Formation Documents     |     |    |     |
| Applicable District Values                  |     |    |     |
| County Project Acceptance Letter            |     |    |     |
| 75% Refund Calculations                     |     |    |     |
| Site Location Map                           |     |    |     |
| Contract & Change Orders                    |     |    |     |
| Purchasing Authorizations                   |     |    |     |
| Contract Summary                            |     |    |     |
| Payment Recap                               |     |    |     |
| Cancelled Checks & Supporting Documentation |     |    |     |
| Additional Documentation                    |     |    |     |
| Plans                                       |     |    |     |

Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_

Name Title-Developer Date:

Submitted to: Name Title - County Date:

**FOR COUNTY USE ONLY**

Assigned to:

Name Title Date

Approved by:

Name Title Date

Sent to Fiscal by:

Name Title Date